

Epping Forest District Council Representations to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID 2583 Name Gail McKay

Method Survey

Date

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Survey Response:

1. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

I do not agree green belt land should be released at all. I do not agree with the developments along the Central Line (Loughton, Debden, Theydon Bois, Epping) as the infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional influx of people, and I do not believe the infrastructure will be sufficiently developed to compensate.

3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow?

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID 2583 Name Gail McKay

4. Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in...

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

5. Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

1. I disagree with the proposal to build housing on the car park at Loughton Station, because: - It will reduce car parking for the station and Loughton town centre - it will push parking onto local streets e.g. Algers Road and surrounding roads for parking for the new housing (the allocated parking to new residents is unlikely to be sufficient) and for the station (any replacement parking will be reduced numbers to that which is available now). - the additional traffic for the new houses will worsen traffic congestion around the station and to the high road, which is already bad - if the Finlaison Way footpath to/from the station and Algers road remains it will be enclosed by the new houses and will feel less safe for people to use, than the open aspect currently across the car park which gives an impression of safety as you are visible. - if the finlaison footpath is affected negatively by the new housing, this would cause problems for thousands of residents who use that path to access public transport daily. I believe this site should fully remain for car parking as at present and housing provision should be made elsewhere. 2. I disagree with the proposal to build housing on the Trapps Hill Car Park, by the library and leisure centre, because: - it will reduce car parking for leisure facilities of three well

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

used public amenities - the library and resource centre, the leisure centre, and the children play area, vital for wellbeing of the community and access to community resources and facilities. - it will reduce car parking for the town centre - reducing the shopping and economics prosperity of the town which is already in decline. - the additional residential numbers it will create will add additional traffic congestion to the area. I believe this site should fully remain for car parking as at present and housing provision should be made elsewhere. 3. I believe all the proposals in Loughton should be rejected as: they will cause additional traffic congestion in already congested areas; they will add pressure to local amenities e.g. school places will increase in areas where all schools are already oversubscribed and having to expand to accommodate current population

growth; and they will bring more people into an area where the public transport infrastructure is already over demand - the central line is already at capacity in peak periods.

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?